UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,122	02/17/2004	Ganesh Basawapatna	119691-163492	1976

60172 7590 12/09/2008

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
1420 FIFTH, SUITE 3010
SEATTLE, WA 98101

EXAMINER	
HOSSAIN, FARZANA E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2424	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/781,122	BASAWAPATNA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FARZANA E. HOSSAIN	2424	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-25,28-30,34-37 and 41-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-25,28-30,34-37 and 41-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 August 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office is in response to communications filed on 08/07/2008. Claims 1-20, 26, 27, 31-33, 38-40 are cancelled. Claims 21-23, 25, 29, 30, 34, 36, 37 are amended. Claims 24, 28, 35 and 41-43 have been previously presented. Claims 44-48 are new.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding 102 rejection of Claims 21 and 34, the applicant argues that the examiner points to the subscriber's house in Kitamura - Figure 3, 117 (Page 11). The applicant argues that the Kitamura teaches a direct connection between the switching means and the subscriber as opposed to an interface unit (Pages 11-12). The applicant also argues that the applicant's specification at least at paragraphs 0037 and 0038 that a TV receiver is incapable of operating as the Applicant's interface unit (Page 12).

In response to the argument, the examiner would like to point to Figure 3, 117 which contains receivers and televisions which each equate to the interface unit (Figure 3, Figure 12). The applicants arguments that there is a direct connection in Kitamura and does not disclose an interface unit. The applicant is arguing elements found in the

specification that are not disclosed in the claims. The claims merely disclose an interface unit that is located at a customer location that corresponds to the received decoder. Kitamura discloses the interface unit at the customer location (Figure 3, 117, Receivers). The rejection is maintained.

3. Regarding the 103 rejection of Claims 21 and 34, the applicants disagree with the examiner stating that one or more receiver decoders within each service module to not select all of the selected signals (Page 12, Page 13). The argument also argues that the newly amended limitations are not found in Stoel or Kitamura (Pages 12-13).

In response to the arguments, Stoel discloses that a service module receives multiplexed video signal, therefore, there is at least one receiver/decoder within the service module (Figure 1, 28) which selects one or more video channels not all (Column 2, lines 53-64). Kitamura discloses wherein each receiver/decoder is configured to select one or more, but not all, of the selected ones of the signals from one or more of the multiplexed channel signals as video channels (Column 7, lines 5-16). Kitamura discloses remaining limitations regarding the output frequency. Please see rejection. Please see above response for arguments the 102 rejection.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 44 and 46 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 44 and 46 disclose the headend and the local headend. Claim 24 discloses that the

headend is a local headend. Therefore, the headend cannot be separate from the local headend. Claim 46 discloses the local headend where there is no antecedent basis. The claim language is confusing. The Office assumes that the claim language discloses a headend that is remote from the headend which is a local headend.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 21-25, 28-30, 34-37 and 41-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The applicant provides paragraph 0049 for support for new limitations in Claims 21 and 34. The examiner did not find any support for the service module selecting not all the received channels. The service module is a mid point between the headend and the user device and paragraph 0049 provides support of the service module selecting one or more channels.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 21, 22 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kitamura et al (US 6,188,871 and hereafter referred to as "Kitamura").

Regarding Claim 21, Kitamura discloses a cable distribution system, comprising: a headend receptive of signals from a plurality of video sources (Figure 3, 101, Figure 2, Column 6, lines 56-67, Column 7, lines 1-3), selected ones of the signals being multiplexed together to create one or more multiplexed channel signals (Figure 3, 101, Figure 2, Column 6, lines 56-67, Column 7, lines 1-3, Figure 3, 102);

A plurality of service modules associated with the headend (Figure 3, 104, Column 1, lines 35-47),with a plurality of customers (Figure 3, Subscribers 1, 2, M) and each service module associated each service module receiving one or more of the multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 16-34, Figure 3); one or more receiver/decoders within each service module (Figure 1, 105), the one or more receiver/decoders configured to receive the one or more multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 5-34, Figure 3), wherein each receiver/decoder is configured to select

one or more, but not all, of the selected ones of the signals from one or more of the multiplexed channel signals as video channels (Column 7, lines 5-16), further configured to provide the video channels to an interface unit located at a customer location, the interface unit corresponding to the receiver/decoder that received/decoded the video channels (Column 7, lines 5-34, Figure 3, 117, Receiver), wherein each video channel in the subset of video channels is provided at an output frequency unrelated to the conventional cable frequency normally associated with the selected video channel (Column 2, lines 22-47).

Regarding Claim 34, Kitamura discloses a cable distribution system, comprising: a headend receptive of signals from a plurality of video sources (Figure 3, 101, Figure 2, Column 6, lines 56-67, Column 7, lines 1-3), selected ones of the signals being multiplexed together to create one or more multiplexed channel signals (Figure 3, 101, Figure 2, Column 6, lines 56-67, Column 7, lines 1-3, Figure 3, 102);

A plurality of service modules associated with the headend (Figure 3, 104, Column 1, lines 35-47),with a plurality of customers (Figure 3, Subscribers 1, 2, M) and each service module associated each service module receiving one or more of the multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 16-34, Figure 3); one or more receiver/decoders within each service module (Figure 1, 105), the one or more receiver/decoders configured to receive the one or more multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 5-34, Figure 3), wherein each receiver/decoder is configured to select one or more, but not all, of the selected ones of the signals from one or more of the multiplexed channel signals as video channels (Column 7, lines 5-16), further

configured to provide the video channels to an interface unit located at a customer location, the interface unit corresponding to the receiver/decoder that received/decoded the video channels (Column 7, lines 5-34, Figure 3, 117, Receiver), wherein each video channel is provided at is provided at a predetermined output frequency unrelated to the conventional cable frequency normally associated with the selected video channel (Figure 11, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, lines 1-7, 22-47), wherein the predetermined output frequency of each receiver/decoder in a given service module being different from each other, each of the video channels received/decoded by a given service module being combined together into a single signal (Figure 11, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, lines 1-7, 22-47); and a plurality of interface units associated with each service module (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117), each interface unit being located at a customer location (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117), combined with other video channels of any service module into a single signal (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117, Column 10, lines 30-40).

Regarding Claim 22, Kitamura discloses all the limitations of Claim 21. Kitamura discloses that a plurality of interface units, wherein one or more of the plurality of interface units are each separately connected to one of the plurality of service modules (Figure 3, Figure 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 21, 22, 24, 28-30, 34, 35 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoel et al (US 5,905,942 and hereafter referred to as "Stoel") in view of Kitamura.

Regarding Claims 21 and 34, Stoel discloses a headend receptive of signals from a plurality of video sources (Figure 1, 12, Figure 3A, 86, 92), selected ones of the signals being multiplexed together to create one or more multiplexed channel signals (Figure 3B, 96); a plurality of service modules associated with the headend (Figure 1, 28), each service module receiving one or more of the multiplexed channel signals (Figure 1, 28); a plurality of interface units associated with each service module (Figure 1, 18), each interface unit being located at a customer location, each interface unit receptive of the video channel and providing same to a video displaying apparatus (Figure 1, 18, Column 1, lines 64-67, Column 2, lines 1-23, Figure 2, 44). Stoel discloses one or r receiver/decoders or receiver/de-interdictor within each service module as the service module receives signals from the headend and the receiver/de-interdictor configured to receive the one more signals, to select one or more video channels, not all, of the selected ones of the signals from one or more of the multiplexed channel signals as video channels (Column 2, lines 53-64) and provide the video channel that is determined by the headend via control signals sent to the interdiction field unit, each video channel received/decoded or de-interdicted by the given service

module or interdiction field unit being sent to the interface unit (Column 4, lines 45-55, Column 5, lines 10-20). Stoel is silent on a service module providing each of a plurality of receiver/decoders within each service module that each receive/decode a selected video channel and provide the video channel at a selected output frequency unrelated to the conventional cable frequency normally associated with the selected video channel, each video channel received/decoded by a given service module being sent to the interface unit corresponding to that receiver/decoder. Stoel does not explicitly disclose each interface unit associated with the service module being receptive of the single signal from the service module, each interface unit proving only one of the video channels in the single signal to a video displaying apparatus (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117, Column 10, lines 30-40). In analogous art, Kitamura discloses a plurality of service modules associated with the headend (Figure 3, 104, Column 1, lines 35-47),with a plurality of customers (Figure 3, Subscribers 1, 2, M) and each service module associated each service module receiving one or more of the multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 16-34, Figure 3); one or more receiver/decoders within each service module (Figure 1, 105), the one or more receiver/decoders configured to receive the one or more multiplexed channel signals (Column 7, lines 5-34, Figure 3), wherein each receiver/decoder is configured to select one or more, but not all, of the selected ones of the signals from one or more of the multiplexed channel signals as video channels (Column 7, lines 5-16), further configured to provide the video channels to an interface unit located at a customer location, the interface unit corresponding to the receiver/decoder that received/decoded the video channels (Column 7, lines 5-34,

Figure 3, 117, Receiver), wherein each video channel in the subset of video channels is provided at an output frequency unrelated to the conventional cable frequency normally associated with the selected video channel (Column 2, lines 22-47) and wherein the predetermined output frequency of each receiver/decoder in a given service module being different from each other, each of the video channels received/decoded by a given service module being combined together into a single signal (Figure 11, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, lines 1-7, 22-47); and a plurality of interface units associated with each service module (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117), each interface unit being located at a customer location (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117), combined with other video channels of any service module into a single signal (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117, Column 10, lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stoel with the remaining limitations as taught by Kitamura in order to provide a system which allows a subscriber in a home to enjoy CATV on two different TV sets installed in different rooms (Column 1, lines 56-64) as disclosed by Kitamura.

Regarding Claim 22, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claim 21. Stoel discloses that a plurality of interface units, wherein one or more of the plurality of interface units are each separately connected to one of the plurality of service modules (Figure 1, 16). Kitamura discloses that a plurality of interface units, wherein one or more of the plurality of interface units are each separately connected to one of the plurality of service modules (Figure 3, Figure 13).

Regarding Claims 24 and 35, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 21 and 34 respectively. Stoel discloses a headend is a local headend located in a building or set of buildings where the customer locations are (Figure 1, 12).

Regarding Claims 28 and 41, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 21 and 34 respectively. Kitamura discloses that service modules include frequency converters (Figure 3) and that the service module distributes frequencies to subscribers lines in the service module or regional common block (Figure 11), the service module includes a frequency converter to signals to a predetermined frequency (Column 2, lines 35-45), and each interface unit does not include a frequency converter (Figure 12).

Regarding Claim 29 and 42, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 21 and 34 respectively. Kitamura discloses that each service module is configured to utilize the same predetermined frequencies as each other service module as the service modules or regional common blocks can be connected in parallel so that a subscriber belonging to one service module can be accepted by another service module so that a subscriber can provide the user with the requested service based on a predetermined vacant channel (Column 11, lines 15-54).

Regarding Claim 30 and 43, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 21 and 34 respectively. Stoel discloses each interface unit is configured to pass information back upstream to its associated service module that includes channel selection information for interactive sessions including (Column 3, lines 45-55, Column 4, lines 46-67, Column 5, lines 1-26).

11. Claims 23 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoel in view of Kitamura as applied to claims 21 and 35 above, and further in view of Farber et al (US 6,486,907 and hereafter referred to as "Farber").

Regarding Claim 23, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claim 21. Kitamura discloses that the selected output frequency of each receiver/decoder in a given service module is different from each (Figure 11, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, lines 1-7, 22-47), each of the video channels received/decoded by a given service module being combined together into a single signal and further wherein each interface unit is receptive of the single signal and from the service module (Figure 11, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, lines 1-7, 22-47), the interface unit providing only a selected one of the video channels in the single signal to the video displaying apparatus (Figure 2, Figure 3, 117, Column 10, lines 30-40). Stoel and Kitamura are silent on interface units arranged in a loop through relationship with respect to their respective service modules. Farber discloses interface units are arranged in a loop through relationship with respect to their service modules (Figure 1, Figure 2, 46, 54, and 58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include interface units are arranged in a loop through relationship with respect to their service modules (Figure 1, Figure 2, 46, 54, 58) as taught by Farber in order to improve of the performance of distribution of satellite signals in an apartment building outputting in a single cable (Column 1, lines 32-44, 66-67, Column 2, lines 1-9) as disclosed by Farber.

Regarding Claim 37, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claim 35. Stoel discloses that service modules are dispersed throughout the building or set of buildings (Figure 1, 28, 18A-D). Stoel and Kitamura are silent on at least one service module for each floor of the building or set of buildings. Farber discloses at least one service module located at differing locations throughout each floor of the building or set of buildings (Figure 2, 46, 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include at least one service module for each floor of the building or set of buildings (Figure 2, 46, 54) as taught by Farber in order to improve of the performance of distribution of satellite signals in an apartment building outputting in a single cable (Column 1, lines 32-44, 66-67, Column 2, lines 1-9) as disclosed by Farber.

12. Claims 25, 36 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoel in view of Kitamura as applied to claims 24, 31 and 35 above, and further in view of Hoarty et al (US 2005/0114906 and hereafter referred to as "Hoarty").

Regarding Claims 25 and 36, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 24 and 35 respectively. Stoel discloses that the headend is a local headend located in a building or set of buildings where the customer locations are (Figure 1, 12). Stoel and Kitamura are silent on master headend that is remote from the building or the set of buildings, the regional headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to the local headend. Hoarty discloses a local headend (Figure 1, 11) and master

headend remote from the local headend (Figure 1, 15), the regional headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to the local headend (Figure 1, Page 3, paragraph 0046, Page 8, paragraphs 0054, 0057). It is necessarily included that if the master headend is remote from the local headend, it remote from the building or set of buildings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include master headend remote from the local headend (Figure 1, 15), the master headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to the local headend (Figure 1, Page 3, paragraph 0046, Page 8, paragraphs 0054, 0057) as taught by Hoarty in order to provide an improved system to handle switching and computing demands to provide separate and private information services simultaneously (Page 1, paragraph 0006, Page 3, paragraph 0046) as disclosed by Hoarty.

Regarding Claims 44, 45, 46 and 47, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claims 24, 24, 34 and 34 respectively. Stoel discloses that the headend is a local headend located in a building or set of buildings where the customer locations are (Figure 1, 12). Stoel and Kitamura are silent on headend that is remote from the building or the set of buildings, the second headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to a local headend. Hoarty discloses a local headend (Figure 1, 11) and a second headend remote from the local headend (Figure 1, 15), the headend or second headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to the local headend (Figure 1, Page 3, paragraph 0046, Page 8, paragraphs 0054, 0057). It is necessarily included that if the master headend is remote from the local headend, it

remote from the building or set of buildings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include a headend or second headend remote from the local headend (Figure 1, 15), the headend or second headend providing video channels at selected frequencies to the local headend (Figure 1, Page 3, paragraph 0046, Page 8, paragraphs 0054, 0057) as taught by Hoarty in order to provide an improved system to handle switching and computing demands to provide separate and private information services simultaneously (Page 1, paragraph 0006, Page 3, paragraph 0046) as disclosed by Hoarty.

13. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoel in view of Kitamura as applied to claims 34 above, and further in view of Granger (US 5,483,277).

Regarding Claim 48, Stoel and Kitamura disclose all the limitations of Claim 34. Stoel and Kitamura are silent on including a separate fixed frequency bandpass filter located at each customer location for each interface unit, the bandpass filter substantially preventing video channels other than the selected video channel associated with that interface unit to pass through to the interface unit. Granger discloses a separate fixed frequency bandpass filter located at each customer location for each interface unit, the bandpass filter substantially preventing video channels other than the selected video channel associated with that interface unit to pass through to the interface unit (Column 6, lines 42-56, Column 7, lines 43-55). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include a separate fixed frequency bandpass filter located at each customer location for each interface unit, the bandpass filter substantially preventing video channels other than the selected video channel associated with that interface unit to pass through to the interface unit (Column 6, lines 42-56, Column 7, lines 43-55) as taught by Granger in order to be connect to only requested TV channels and a VCR channel (Column 1, lines 53-67, Column 2, lines 1-10) as disclosed by Granger.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FARZANA E. HOSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424

FEH
November 26, 2008